

The Development and Validation of the Genderism and Transphobia Scale

Darryl B. Hill^{1,3} and Brian L. B. Willoughby²

A series of three studies were conducted to develop and validate a scale to measure violence, harassment, and discrimination toward cross-dressers, transgenderists, and transsexuals. In Study 1, we developed the Genderism and Transphobia Scale (GTS). In Study 2, we established the GTS's ability to predict parents' reactions to either a gender conforming or a gender non-conforming boy or girl. Correlations between the GTS and scales that assess homophobia and gender role ideologies suggest convergent validity. In Study 3, we conducted a factor analysis of the scale, found further evidence of the scale's discriminant and convergent validity, and tested the scale's ability to predict previous contact with gender non-conformists. Taken as a whole, the results of these studies demonstrate the basic psychometric properties of a new and useful scale to measure antipathy toward people who cross genders and sexes.

KEY WORDS: genderism; transphobia; hate; transsexual; prejudice; transgender.

Discrimination and prejudicial attitudes are common topics in gender research. Although sexism has received considerable attention, few professionals have investigated the prejudice and violence experienced by individuals who cross or change genders. There is very little systematic research on discrimination against transsexuals (those who use or want to use hormones and/or surgery to change their gender and live full-time in their adopted gender), transgenderists (those who change gender often with minimal medical intervention, sometimes moving back and forth between genders), and cross-dressers (those who change gender temporarily using mostly outward symbols of gender like clothing) referred to collectively here as trans persons. Can anti-trans sentiments be measured reliably

with a questionnaire? Are hateful attitudes toward gender non-conformists conceptually related to other constructs like heterosexism and beliefs about gender? To answer these questions, the following three studies report on efforts to operationalize and conceptualize anti-trans attitudes, feelings, and behaviors.

Evidence of Anti-Trans Actions

There is anecdotal evidence to suggest that anti-trans sentiments are pervasive in Western culture. Those in contact with the trans community hear regularly of US and Canadian trans women who have been attacked and killed because of their gender, and a few of these cases have gained international attention (e.g., the murder of Brandon Teena). Websites and organizations document the regularity of violence and discrimination against trans persons (e.g., the "Remembering Our Dead" webpage at <http://www.gender.org/remember/>). More formally, a survey conducted in the United Kingdom in late 2000 showed that transsexuals in the workplace suffered a wide range of discriminatory practices (Whittle,

¹College of Staten Island, City University of New York, New York.

²University of Miami.

³To whom correspondence should be addressed at Department of Psychology, College of Staten Island, 2800 Victory Blvd., Staten Island, New York 10314; e-mail: darryllhill@verizon.net.

n.d.). Although unemployment rates among transsexuals were close to the national average, many had had to change jobs across their transition, and the majority of their employers failed to support their new gender. Non-governmental organizations have also reported discrimination when trans persons search for housing or public accommodations, access health care and social services, such as youth and womens' shelters, or seek treatment for alcohol and drug problems (e.g., Coalition for Lesbian and Gay Rights in Ontario, 1997).

The extent of negative attitudes and discrimination against trans persons is suggestive, but research on the question is only just beginning. For example, in a non-random convenience sample, Gagné, Tweksbury, and McGaughey (1996) claimed that a "substantial minority of respondents had experienced intimidation, harassment, and violence in public places" (p. 505). However, this finding was not explored in any detail in their study. Another study, Lombardi, Wilchins, Priesing, and Malouf (2001) attempted to estimate the prevalence of trans-persons' experiences with violence and discrimination. They distributed questionnaires to assess various forms of violence and harassment to anyone who identified as "transgendered" (understood as an inclusive identity for cross-dressers, transgenderists, and transsexuals) via community centers and the Internet. Results demonstrated that 60% of the respondents reported having been victimized: they experienced harassment by strangers on the street, verbal abuse, assault with a weapon, and/or sexual assault. Over one-third (37%) of the respondents also reported having experienced economic discrimination (e.g., being fired, demoted, or unfairly disciplined), which they attributed to their gender non-conformity. This research suggested that those who transgress gender norms may be at high risk of employment discrimination and/or physical and verbal abuse. However, these results are not entirely convincing. Further research on randomly selected samples of trans persons is required to determine whether the results generalize beyond this convenience sample. Moreover, given that Lombardi and colleagues' sample was largely male-to-female trans persons, results may not generalize to female-to-male trans persons who may benefit financially from their shift in gender and their increase in social status.

A few surveys suggested that trans people may not experience intolerance in specific contexts.

Early studies of attitudes toward transsexuals among medical and psychiatric professionals documented fairly negative views (Green, Stoller, & MacAndrew, 1966), but attitudes among mental health professionals seem to be fairly positive 20 years later. Results of a survey of the attitudes of health care professionals toward transsexuals suggested that most support the basic human rights of transsexuals with only minor and specific reservations about transsexuals as a group (Franzini & Casinelli, 1986).

Another context in which positive reactions to transsexuals have been documented is within feminist communities. Historically, there have been conflicts between feminists and transsexuals, especially concerning transsexual women's participation in the Michigan Women's Music Festival, but this may not be widespread. Kendel, Devor, and Strapko (1997) surveyed attendees at the festival and via the Internet through feminist and lesbian bulletin boards. The majority of respondents were either neutral or positive toward transsexual women; a majority supported inclusion of male-to-female transsexuals in women-only events, and a majority said they would exclude transsexual men from similar contexts. Those qualifications aside, "One hundred percent of those polled agree that transsexuals should have the same human rights as everyone else" (Kendel et al., 1997, p. 156).

Surveys of the general public's attitudes have also showed surprising levels of acceptance, especially considering the anecdotal evidence mentioned earlier. In the early 1980s, Leitenberg and Slavin (1983) compared attitudes toward transsexuals and homosexuals. By contrasting responses to individual questions (e.g., "I believe homosexuals/transsexuals should be allowed to adopt children"), they found that, overall, transsexuality was more accepted than homosexuality. For example, both women and men indicated that homosexuality was "always wrong" more often than transsexuality, and they were more favorable toward the adoption of children by transsexuals than by homosexuals. A recent national random survey in Sweden showed that the majority supported publicly-funded sex reassignment surgery, the right for transsexuals to marry, and having transsexuals as co-workers (Landen & Innala, 2000). They also found a gender difference: men were less tolerant than women on many dimensions, a finding common in anti-gay research. In a recent US study, Harvey (2002) found an overall positive and tolerant attitude toward transsexuals: most of his

respondents indicated that they were generally accepting of both female-to-male and male-to-female transsexuals, would accept transsexual co-workers, and would shop at a store that had transsexual employees, but only a minority supported health coverage for sex reassignment surgery.

In contrast to the above studies, experimental research that involves comparisons of reactions of participants to gays, lesbians, and members of the trans community (i.e., transgenderists and cross-dressers), however, suggest that reactions to gender non-conformity are not all that positive. Moulton and Adams-Price (1997) examined attitudes of gay and straight men toward vignettes that described gay and heterosexual cross-dressing men. They found that, overall, gay men were more tolerant of cross-dressing than heterosexual men, but heterosexual men viewed both gay and straight cross-dressers negatively, regardless of sexual orientation. Rye and Elmslie (2001a, 2002) reported that transgender and transsexual people—described in hypothetical vignettes—were seen less favorably than gay men, but transsexual and transgender individuals were still rated slightly to moderately positive on average.

Overall, these observations of generally positive opinions about trans people contrast greatly with anecdotal evidence. What can account for the discrepancy between claims that trans people are targets of hateful behavior and studies that show weak evidence of this hate? It may simply be that a minority of the trans community is at higher risk for discrimination and violence. For example, transsexual women sex workers are probably at a higher risk than transsexual men or others in the community (Weinberg, Shaver, & Williams, 1999). A comparison of hate experienced by various members of the trans community is needed. Moreover, it may be that most people are reasonably tolerant of trans people, whereas a minority are extremely hateful—a situation that could not be detected by examining average responses to questions on a survey.

There are also problems in the methods of the above studies. Most important, none of the researchers deployed a comprehensive, reliable, or valid measure of anti-trans views. Many relied on single-item measures that lack psychometric strength and offer little insight into individuals' responses. Moreover, survey research can fail to reveal fully people's discriminating behaviors and prejudicial at-

titudes, perhaps because of social demand characteristics that are commonly associated with surveys. Respondents may simply know and offer the socially appropriate response, but their underlying values and feelings may reject extreme gender non-conformity. Ideally, studies of anti-trans reactions should be more covert and able to tap into both overt reactions and more subtle values and ideology that underly intolerance of gender boundary transgressions. Thus, it is crucial to develop an instrument that measures values, ideology, and beliefs that might underlie hatred of gender non-conformists.

A further problem with the research to date is that it has been focused mostly on attitudes toward transsexuals who may "fit in" to prevailing social norms by passing as ordinary men and women. Cross-dressers and transgenderists, who may not pass so successfully, due to the fact that they may not surgically alter their bodies and faces, may experience a great deal more negative reaction. That is, a study of attitudes toward more obvious cases of gender non-conformity may elicit stronger negative responses. Moreover, because most people have never personally met a trans person, their attitudes may not be fully available or salient to them. As suggested earlier, it may be the case that, on average, people are generally tolerant of gender variance, but there may be a minority with extremely negative attitudes. It is important, then, to design a multi-item instrument with psychometric properties that can identify people who have strong negative attitudes toward a wide range of gender non-conforming people and behaviors.

Conceptualizing Anti-Trans Sentiments and Behaviors

In the last few years, researchers have begun to conceptualize anti-trans prejudice. For example, Hill (2002) in an analysis of a trans community's experiences, suggested that three key constructs can be used to conceptualize hate against trans persons: transphobia, genderism, and gender-bashing. Transphobia is an emotional disgust toward individuals who do not conform to society's gender expectations. Similar to homophobia, the fear or aversion to homosexuals (e.g., Weinberg, 1972), transphobia involves the feeling of revulsion to masculine women, feminine men, cross-dressers, transgenderists, and/or transsexuals. Specifically, transphobia manifests

itself in the fear that personal acquaintances may be trans or disgust upon encountering a trans person. Note that the use of the “-phobia” suffix does not imply that a transphobic person suffers clinical phobic reactions; nor does it imply that the transphobic person is suffering from a disorder. The “phobia” suffix is used to imply an irrational fear or hatred, one that is at least partly perpetuated by cultural ideology. Genderism is an ideology that reinforces the negative evaluation of gender non-conformity or an incongruence between sex and gender. It is a cultural belief that perpetuates negative judgments of people who do not present as a stereotypical man or woman. Those who are genderist believe that people who do not conform to sociocultural expectations of gender are pathological. Similar to heterosexism, we propose that genderism is both a source of social oppression and psychological shame, such that it can be imposed on a person, but also that a person may internalize these beliefs. Finally, gender-bashing refers to the assault and/or harassment of persons who do not conform to gender norms (Wilchins, 1997). Thus, genderism is the broad negative cultural ideology, transphobia is the emotional disgust and fear, and gender-bashing is the fear manifest in acts of violence (Hill, 2002).

The above findings readily suggest a conceptual framework central to the study of discrimination and violence against trans persons. The goal of our first study was to develop a questionnaire to assess genderism, transphobia, and gender-bashing.

STUDY 1

The goal of this study was to develop a short psychometric questionnaire to assess negative attitudes toward trans persons. We sought to develop a scale that would tap into affective, cognitive, and behavioral expressions of transphobic and genderist attitudes, along with tendencies to act violently toward trans persons (i.e., gender-bashing). This first study describes the initial development of this scale and provides some preliminary psychometric evidence of its reliability and validity.

Method

Participants

Research assistants administered a questionnaire to 227 volunteer undergraduate students at Concordia University in Montréal; they were re-

cruited primarily from undergraduate classes in psychology. Eighty-seven men and 140 women completed the questionnaire. Race/ethnicity was not asked of participants, partly to increase a sense of anonymity, and the statistics for race/ethnicity on the campus as a whole were not known. This particular campus is well-known for its racial and ethnic diversity (e.g., for admissions in the year 2000, 59% claimed English as their language of origin, 16% were French, and 25% stated “other”). Participants ranged in age from 18 to 50, with an average age of 22 years ($SD = 4.6$). All participants were currently working on an undergraduate degree; none had completed a degree. Most of the sample identified as heterosexual (94%); some (4%) identified as bisexual, and the remainder (2%) identified as lesbian or gay. All participants were entered into a raffle for a prize of \$100 as an incentive.

Materials

We generated potential items for the scale by reviewing the literature on anti-trans sentiments and the difficulties trans persons have on a day-to-day basis. We then wrote 150 statements that may measure cognitive, behavioral, and affective dimensions of genderism, transphobia, and gender-bashing. Special care was taken to include statements that referred to both male and female gender non-conformists (e.g., both female-to-male and male-to-female). After eliminating redundancy and balancing negatively and positively worded items, 106 items remained. Participants rated their agreement to the statements on a 7-point Likert scale (1 = *strongly agree* to 7 = *strongly disagree*).

Procedure

After receiving permission from instructors of courses, researchers informed participants about the purpose of the study, obtained written consent (participation was voluntary), distributed, and collected the questionnaires at the end of a class. Participants handed in their questionnaire as they left the room. It took between 5 and 15 minutes to complete.

Results

Item Selection

Weak questionnaire items were progressively eliminated using increasingly conservative criteria.

First, items were rejected if the range of item scores indicated either a ceiling or floor effect. For example, the average of responses on a 7-point scale (7 = *strongly disagree*, 1 = *strongly disagree*) to the item “I would date someone who had changed their sex” was very high ($M = 6.1$, $SD = 1.5$). This item and other similarly performing items were deleted. Second, items that correlated at .5 or lower with any of the subscale totals (i.e., genderism, transphobia, and gender-bashing) or the total score were removed. For example, the item “Women bodybuilders are beautiful” correlated $-.17$ with the transphobia subscale and was removed. Then, from the remaining pool of items, based on the item-subscale correlations, we picked the best 10 questions for each of the three subscales. In two cases, the items were similarly correlated, thus 32 items in total were selected (see appendix).

Reliability

To get an estimate of the internal consistency among the remaining items, coefficient α was calculated for each subscale. Overall, the coefficient α were very good for the subscales: .83 for genderism, .94 for transphobia, and .79 for gender-bashing. Not surprisingly, given the high correlations between the subscales, the coefficient α for all 32 items together was also high: .95. Table I provides the inter-scale correlations, which were also high.

Validity

One preliminary estimate of the validity of this scale is its ability to detect the well-known gender differences in attitudes toward trans persons. Consistent with expectations, a test of gender differences on each of the three subscales of the shortened version netted significant results in each dimension, with men reporting: more genderism ($M = 33.4$, $SD = 11.4$) than women ($M = 25.5$, $SD = 9.7$), $t(225) = 5.37$, $p = .0001$; more transphobia ($M =$

43.2, $SD = 17.9$) than women ($M = 28.8$, $SD = 14.4$), $t(225) = 6.30$, $p = .0001$; and more gender-bashing ($M = 29.3$, $SD = 10.3$) than women ($M = 20.0$, $SD = 7.2$), $t(225) = 7.36$, $p = .0001$.

Discussion

The goal of Study 1 was to identify a small pool of items that could be used to measure feelings, attitudes, values, beliefs, and behaviors toward a wide range of gender non-conformity. Basic scale construction procedures netted a short scale, which we titled the Genderism and Transphobia Scale (GTS). The three subscales (i.e., genderism, transphobia, and gender-bashing) have reasonable internal consistency and the ability to detect gender differences in attitudes toward gender non-conformity.

STUDY 2

In Study 2, we sought to test the validity and reliability of the GTS. Although the results of Study 1 suggested that the GTS was a capable measure of genderism, transphobia, and gender-bashing, it was unknown whether it measured other theoretically related constructs (i.e., whether the scale had convergent validity). In this case, however, there were no other measures that purported to assess the exact constructs of transphobia and genderism. Therefore, we turned to conceptually similar constructs, namely attitudes toward homosexuals and beliefs about gender roles. It may be that most people find transphobia and homophobia quite similar because gender non-conformists are often perceived as homosexual such that gays and lesbians who violate gender roles are at higher risk of violence (D’Augelli, 1998; Feinberg, 1996; Gagné et al., 1996; Harry, 1992; Herek, 1993; Neisen, 1990). Therefore, masculine women, feminine men, and trans persons may be most at risk of violence because, whether or not they actually are homosexual, they fail to fulfill their expected gender roles (Namaste, 1996). It is logical to suspect, then, that those who are transphobic also tend to be homophobic (Rye & Elmslie, 2001a, 2001b, 2002).

The genderism construct may also be synonymous with beliefs about gender role ideology. For example, Kerr and Holden (1996) defined gender role ideology as prescriptive beliefs about appropriate behavior for men and women. They have found that their Gender Role Beliefs Scale (GRBS) can

Table I. Subscale Correlations

	2	3
1. Genderism	.84*	.73*
2. Transphobia	—	.83*
3. Gender-bashing	—	—

* $p < .0001$.

predict highly traditional beliefs about gender. Thus, it would seem that those who believe in highly traditional gender role ideologies might also be highly genderist.

It was also important to establish whether the GTS could predict specific attitudes and behaviors that might be related to discriminatory or violent reactions to trans persons (i.e., whether the scale had predictive validity). It is well-established that most referrals for treatment of gender variance in children and adolescents come from the parents, who seem to be particularly sensitive to gender non-conformity in their children (e.g., Zucker, 2000). Considering these facts, one possible criterion variable might be parental reactions to a gender variant child. Thus, the GTS should be able to predict how intolerant and rejecting a parent might be toward a young gender non-conformist.

We sought answers to two research questions. First, does the GTS measure constructs that theoretically should be related to each other, namely homophobia (heterosexism) and beliefs about gender? Second, can the GTS predict parents' genderist and transphobic reactions to gender non-conformist children? It was hypothesized that the GTS would predict intolerant reactions toward gender non-conforming youth and that the GTS would correlate moderately, but not strongly, with measures of homophobia and gender role ideology.

Method

Participants

Fifty-two English-speaking parents (i.e., individuals who raised, or were currently raising, a child) were recruited in two community centers in Montréal (the name and locations were kept confidential at their request). The participants included 34 mothers and 18 fathers whose ages ranged from 28 to 74 years, with an average age of 45. Participants were well-educated: 33% had a bachelor's degree, 21% had graduate degrees, and 17% had had at least 1 year of college or university. Most participants were married (71%). Data on the race of participants were not collected, but religious affiliation was: one-half of respondents were Catholic (50%); the next most common religious affiliation was Jewish (14%). All parents who participated in the study

were entered into a raffle for one of three cash prizes in the amounts of \$150, \$75, or \$25. Participants who requested the results of the study were sent a brief summary.

Materials

In addition to the GTS scale, several other instruments were used.

Vignettes. The vignettes were approximately 250-word descriptions of a young child; these summarized the child's likes, dislikes, preferred play behaviors, and basic character. There were four vignettes: conformist Timmy (a highly masculine boy), conformist Tammy (a highly feminine girl), non-conformist Timmy (a highly feminine boy), and non-conformist Tammy (a highly masculine girl). The vignettes of conformist Timmy and non-conformist Tammy were nearly identical, except that the names and genders of the child were switched; the same was true of conformist Tammy and non-conformist Timmy. For example, for the non-conformist Timmy vignette, participants were instructed: "Please read the following vignette. It is important that you imagine that Timmy is YOUR son while you read the following description." Then they were given the following passage:

Your son, Timmy, is 6 years old and in his first year of kindergarten. He spends much of his time at school playing with his three best friends—Kimberly, Tiffany, and Lisa. Timmy and his three friends often play dress up. Timmy always insists on playing the fairy princess and wears a pink dress and a diamond crown. At school, Timmy excels in printing, reading, and painting. His teacher describes your son as sensitive, caring, and beautiful. After school, instead of going home to play with his older brother, Timmy always runs to his cousin Meghan's house to play. At his cousin's house, Timmy loves to have chocolate milk as an after-school snack and always visits the bathroom to wash up. Timmy sits on the toilet to urinate, rather than standing like dad does. Timmy often insists on playing 'house' with Meghan where he plays the role of 'mother' and Meghan plays the 'father.' Your son enjoys wearing Meghan's skirts and dresses and often speaks like a girl. He spends hours at Meghan's home, playing the roles of mother, queen, Snow White, Sleeping Beauty, or Cinderella. When not role playing with his cousin, Timmy enjoys playing with Meghan's Barbie toys. There are even times when Timmy likes to be called 'Barbie.' Your son dreams of growing up to be beautiful and successful, like Barbie.

Vignette Assessment Questionnaire. The Vignette Assessment Questionnaire (VAQ) assessed parents' attitudes toward the children described in the vignettes. The VAQ asked parents to make six judgments about the mental health of the child on a 7-point Likert scale. High scorers on the VAQ rated the child as less happy, indicated a higher degree of concern and worry about the child, showed a desire to change the child's behaviors, would refer the child to a mental health professional, and would label the child as "sick." Basically, the higher the score, the more intolerant a parent was toward the child described in the vignette. The VAQ had an α of .88.

Homophobia Scale. The Homophobia Scale (HS) (Wright, Adams, & Bernat, 1999) is a 5-point (1 = *strongly agree*, 5 = *strongly disagree*) 25-item Likert scale that assesses homophobic beliefs. The scale is based on a definition of homophobia as a fear or aversion to gays and lesbians, as well as a general social attitude that deems homosexuals as lesser individuals. Wright and colleagues' definition of homophobia also includes a behavioral aspect, such as avoiding gays and lesbians or acting out aggressively. Thus, the HS measures the affective, cognitive, and behavioral components of hatred toward gays and lesbians. High scorers on the HS may feel nervous in the company of gay people, disagree on issues of equal rights for gays and lesbians, and attack a homosexual for any flirtatious gestures directed toward him or her. Once again, the higher the score, the more homophobic the respondent.

Gender Role Beliefs Scale. The GRBS (Kerr & Holden, 1996) is a 7-point 20-item Likert scale (1 = *strongly agree*, 7 = *strongly disagree*) which measures gender role ideologies that are defined as prescriptive beliefs about appropriate behavior for men and women. Specifically, this scale measures traditional and non-traditional attitudes toward the roles of men and women. For example, high scorers on this scale believe that men should hold traditionally masculine-stereotyped occupations, be the sole source of financial support for a family, and take the initiative in courting behaviors, whereas women should wear dresses or skirts and women with children should not work.

Procedure

Researchers set up tables in the lobbies of two community centers. A poster asked for parent par-

ticipants and outlined the nature of the prizes that could be won. Those who were interested then approached the experimenter and offered to participate in the study. Community center members who appeared to be unoccupied were also actively recruited by the experimenter. After consenting to participate in the study, a parent received one of four randomly selected vignettes. After reading the vignette, the participant completed the VAQ, and then the HS, the GRBS, and the GTS, counter-balanced for order across all participants. Then the participant completed a general information sheet that asked questions about age, sex, religion, marital status, and parental status. Most completed the package of scales within 45 min; five of the 52 participants, who were short on time, took the questionnaire home and mailed it to the experimenter within the week.

Results

As this was the first administration of the GTS in its short form, an assessment of the internal consistency of the measure was conducted. The overall α for the scale was .88. The α for the subscales were .80 for genderism, .94 for transphobia, and .82 for the gender-bashing subscale. Thus, the GTS appeared to have consistently reasonable internal reliability.

A manipulation check was conducted to ensure that parents viewed the conformist children as different from the non-conformist children. Parents' VAQ ratings of the conformist children were compared to ratings of the non-conformist children. Consistent with expectations, parents rated the conformist children as less pathological overall ($M = 14.4$, $SD = 6.8$) than the non-conformist children ($M = 18.8$, $SD = 7.8$), $t(50) = -2.16$, $p = .05$. Thus, non-conformist children were indeed viewed more negatively than gender conformist children by these parents, and this indicates that the manipulation of their perceptions was successful.

Next, the GTS's predictive validity was examined using regression analysis. To investigate the prediction that the GTS would be able to predict intolerant attitudes toward gender non-conformist children, GTS scores were used to predict VAQ ratings for the non-conformist children only. Based only on the data from those parents who responded to the non-conformist children ($n = 29$), the GTS

reasonably predicted the VAQ ratings, $R^2 = .50$, $\beta = .71$, $F(1, 27) = 26.9$, $p = .0001$. Next we performed a simultaneous forward multiple regression analysis on the three scales combined (the GTS, HS, and GRBS), which increased the prediction of the VAQ scales slightly, $R^2 = .55$, $F(3, 25) = 10.20$, $p = .0001$. Individually, none were significant predictors of the VAQ scores, a result typical of studies with such a small sample size. β estimates, however, suggest that the HS scale was the best predictor, $\beta = .50$, of VAQ scores, followed by the GTS scale, $\beta = .34$, and the GRBS, $\beta = -.12$.

It was also hypothesized that the GTS would measure theoretical constructs similar, but not identical, to homophobia and gender role beliefs. Thus, it was suspected that the GTS would correlate moderately with both the HS and GRBS. The GTS significantly correlated with the HS, $r(52) = .87$, $p = .0001$, and the GRBS, $r(52) = .65$, $p = .0001$. Thus, in this sample, the GTS seems to be highly related to homophobia and beliefs about gender roles.

Discussion

In this first test of the GTS, there was evidence of high internal consistency and validity. Scores on the GTS were moderately related to parents' reactions to gender non-conforming children, which indicates reasonable predictive validity for the GTS. The GTS scale appeared to predict parents' rejection of gender non-conforming children. However, an initial test of convergent validity showed that GTS scores were strongly correlated with homophobia and beliefs about gender roles. Indeed, the regression analysis suggests that the GTS, HS, and GRBS scales measured a similar construct, which perhaps indicated multicollinearity among the variables. In other words, these results suggest that there is reasonable convergent validity, in that GTS scores correlated with scores on tests of similar constructs. However, because of these findings, the GTS lacks discriminant validity, at least in terms of homophobia and gender role beliefs.

There were a few limitations to Study 2. The small sample size posed problems for the analyses, especially in terms of the regression analysis. Thus, these results need to be replicated in a larger sample. Second, even though the sample was

diverse in age, religion, and marital status, over 50% of the participants had a bachelor's degree or higher. Although this community sample was much more varied than an undergraduate population in terms of age, this was a highly educated sample unrepresentative of most parents or the population in general. Moreover, because we assessed only the relationship between GTS scores and reactions to gender non-conforming children, further studies should examine whether the results generalize to intolerant reactions to gender non-conforming adults.

STUDY 3

Study 2 established that the GTS scale performed as expected, with good internal reliability and predictive validity in a small sample. Study 3 was conducted as a test of the GTS scale in a more diverse and larger sample. The intent for Study 3 was to establish norms on the scale for a broad university student population, retest subscale correlations, coefficient α estimates of internal reliability, and to conduct a confirmatory factor analysis of the subscale structures. A further test of the predictive validity of the scale was also conducted. Given Harvey's (2002) finding that personal acquaintance with someone who is transgender, transsexual, or a cross-dresser potentially mediates discriminatory responses and attitudes, in this study we tested the ability of the scale to detect differences in attitudes between those who were personally acquainted with the gender variant people and those who were not. To explore further the discriminative and convergent validity of the scale, responses to the GTS were compared to measures of self-esteem, gender role orientation, gender role ideology, homophobia, a short estimate of anti-trans attitudes, and a faking scale.

Given the results of prior studies, it was hypothesized that women and those who were personally acquainted with someone who was transsexual, transgender, or a cross-dresser would score lower than others on the GTS scale. Moreover, it was hypothesized that GTS scores would correlate moderately with measures of gender role ideology, homophobia, and the short estimate of anti-trans attitudes, but correlate poorly with measures of self-esteem, gender role orientation, and faking.

Method

Participants

Participants were 180 undergraduate and graduate students, drawn from a wide range of disciplines at Concordia University in Montréal. The 81 men and 98 women (and 1 unknown) ranged in age from 18 to 73 years, with a mean age of 25. All participants were English speaking. Most participants had completed high school or the Québec equivalent (66%), one-third had completed a bachelor's degree (31%), and a few had completed a graduate degree (4%). Most were single (72%); one-fourth of the sample were married (24%), and the remaining (4%) were widowed or divorced.

Materials

Participants completed a questionnaire assessing demographics and three questions assessing whether they had been acquainted with a cross-dresser, transsexual, or transgenderist. These terms were not defined for respondents; the main issue was whether or not participants were familiar with anyone who identified as such.

In addition to the GTS scale, the HS scale, and the GRBS scale (all previously described), participants completed the following instruments.

Rosenberg Self-esteem Scale. The Rosenberg Self-esteem Scale (RSES) (Rosenberg, 1965) is a widely used measure of global self-esteem. The 5-point 10-item Likert items (1 = *strongly agree*, 5 = *strongly disagree*) ask respondents to indicate agreement for items such as "I take a positive attitude towards myself." A higher score indicates a more positive view of oneself. In this study, the coefficient α for these items was .80.

Bem Sex Role Inventory. The Bem Sex Role Inventory (BSRI) (Bem, 1974) is a measure of people's sense of their self as masculine or feminine. The adjective-checklist style questions ask respondents to indicate how true an adjective is as a description of their self (on a scale of 1 = *never true of me* to 7 = *always true of me*). There are 60 items: 20 stereotypically masculine items (e.g., independent, assertive), 20 stereotypically feminine items (e.g., warm, soft-spoken), and 20 neutral items (e.g., tactful, likeable). The higher the score on the masculine and feminine scales, the more participants endorse items consistent with a stereotypical view of themselves as masculine

or feminine. For the data collected here, the coefficient α of the masculinity scale was .85, and for the femininity scale it was .78.

Eysenk Lie Scale. The Eysenk Lie Scale (ELS) (Eysenck & Eysenck, 1975) is a subscale of the *Eysenck Personality Questionnaire*. This nine item, yes/no response scale, measures a respondent's tendency to present the self in a positive light. For example, respondents who indicate "no" to the item "Do you sometimes gossip?" are believed to be presenting themselves in an overly positive manner. The higher the score, the greater the tendency to present positive responses. In this study, the coefficient α was .84.

Modified Attitude Function Index. The modified Attitude Function Index (AFI) used in this study was a variation of Herek's (1987) Attitudes Toward Lesbian and Gays scale. In its original form, the scale asks a number of questions about gays, but in this version, the term "gays" was replaced with "gender non-conformists." It is a 10-item Likert scale in which respondents rate statements on a 9-point scale (1 = *not true of me* to 9 = *very true of me*). For example, one item is: "My opinions about people who are gender non-conformists are mainly based on my concern that we safeguard the civil liberties of all people in our society." A higher score indicates less tolerance toward gender non-conformity. In the present study, the reliability coefficient α was .79.

Procedure

Three hundred and fifty sets of questionnaires were distributed to interested students enrolled in classes in a variety of academic departments in the social sciences, sciences, and humanities. Researchers entered classrooms and asked for volunteers to complete a package of questionnaires at their own convenience, and then to return the package through campus mail. Those interested in participating were handed an envelope that contained the above scales in random order, along with an instruction sheet and consent form. Participants were asked to complete the questionnaire at home alone and return them within 1 week. It is estimated that the package took participants approximately 1 hour to complete. Once a completed questionnaire was received by the researchers, participants were paid \$8 and were debriefed about the hypotheses and results

Table II. Range, Mean, and Standard Deviation for the GTS

Scale	Range	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>
1. Genderism	10–60	32.3	10.9
2. Transphobia	12–84	40.9	18.8
3. Gender-bashing	10–62	27.2	10.5
4. GTS total	35–194	100.4	37.7

of the study. Just over one-half ($n = 180$) of the questionnaires that were distributed were fully completed and returned. Fourteen of the returned questionnaires had only one missing item on a scale; in these cases, the missing values were replaced by the average value for their responses on that scale. One participant failed to complete the demographic questionnaire.

Results

Table II presents the basic properties of the subscales and the total scores in this study. The mean scores on the GTS were slightly higher in this sample than was the case in Study 1 and 2, indicating slightly more intolerance for gender non-conformity in this diverse sample of participants.

Once again, the subscales of the GTS were internally consistent, with strong coefficient α . The coefficient α for the genderism subscale was .79; .95 for the transphobia subscale; .87 for the gender-bashing subscale; and .96 for the total score. Consistent with the high overall coefficient α , the subscales were also highly correlated, especially the genderism and transphobia subscales, $r = .85$, $p = .01$, which suggests that they may tap highly related dimensions.

A principal components factor analysis was conducted to confirm the existence of three factors in the scale (genderism, transphobia, and gender-bashing). However, given the high correlation between genderism and transphobia, a two-factor solution was seen as most reasonable, with genderism/transphobia as a solid first factor, and gender-bashing as a strong second factor. A principal components analysis with Oblimin rotation using Kaiser normalization converged in eight iterations for a two-factor solution (see Table III for factor loadings). These two factors accounted for 60% of the variance.

Almost all items loaded on the factors for which that item was intended, except for four items: questions 18, 22, 28, and 31. These items were all intended to measure gender-bashing (negative

Table III. GTS Scale Items and Factor Loadings on Confirmatory Principal Components Analysis

Item	Loading
Factor 1. Transphobia/genderism	
7. Men who cross-dress for sexual pleasure disgust me	.86
24. Sex change operations are morally wrong	.81
4. God made two sexes and two sexes only	.80
5. If a friend wanted to have his penis removed in order to become a woman, I would openly support him	.78
17. A man who dresses as a woman is a pervert	.75
30. It is morally wrong for a woman to present herself as a man in public	.74
15. Women who see themselves as men are abnormal	.73
27. People are either men or women	.73
25. Feminine men make me feel uncomfortable	.73
19. Feminine boys should be cured of their problem	.72
16. I would avoid talking to a woman if I knew she had surgically created a penis and testicles	.71
3. If I found out that my best friend was changing their sex, I would freak out	.70
29. Masculine women make me feel uncomfortable	.64
8. Children should be encouraged to explore their masculinity and femininity	.63
26. I would go to a bar that was frequented by females who used to be males	.63
10. Men who act like women should be ashamed of themselves	.63
22. If a man wearing makeup and a dress, who also spoke in a high voice, approached my child, I would use physical force to stop him	.60
11. Men who shave their legs are weird	.59
28. My friends and I have often joked about men who dress like women	.59
14. Children should play with toys appropriate to their own sex	.59
18. If I found out that my lover was the other sex, I would get violent	.54
12. I can't understand why a woman would act masculine	.53
31. It's all right to make fun of people who cross-dress	.52
21. Passive men are weak	.48
23. Individuals should be allowed to express their gender freely	.38
Factor 2. Gender-bashing	
9. If I saw a man on the street that I thought was really a woman, I would ask him if he was a man or a woman	.83
2. I have behaved violently towards a woman because she was too masculine	.82
32. If I encountered a male who wore high-heeled shoes, stockings and makeup, I would consider beating him up	.80

Table III. Continued

Item	Loading
20. I have behaved violently towards a man because he was too feminine	.78
1. I have beat up men who act like sissies	.71
13. I have teased a woman because of her masculine appearance or behavior	.66
6. I have teased a man because of his feminine appearance or behavior	.50

Note. Factor loadings <.4 not reported.

behavioral reactions to gender non-conformity), yet they loaded strongly on the genderism/transphobia dimension. It may be that responses to item 18 (“If I found out that my lover was the other sex, I would get violent”) were measuring both anger at betrayal from a lover and a violent reaction toward a person with a sex change. Item 22 (“If a man wearing makeup and a dress, who also spoke in a high voice, approached my child, I would use physical force to stop him”) may be measuring both parental protectiveness and hatred of trans people per se. Some parents might use physical force to stop *most* people from approaching their children. In any case, these items seemed to assess a more generalized negative reaction, as opposed to a tendency to use violence specifically against a gender variant person. Item 28 (“My friends and I have often joked about men who dress like women”) and item 31 (“It’s all right to make fun of people who crossdress”) appeared to measure qualities related to teasing or making fun of trans people, which are both hurtful behaviors, but nonetheless not actually violent. When these four items (18, 22, 28, 31) were moved to the genderism/transphobia subscale, the α for this combined and revised genderism/transphobia scale was .95.

The administration of other well-established psychometric instruments along with the GTS permitted a further exploration of the scale’s discriminative and convergent validity. As shown in Table IV,

Table IV. Correlations Between the GTS and Other Scales

	AFI	RSES	BSRI-M	BSRI-F	ELS	GRBS	HS
GTS	.55*	.11	-.06	-.09	.23*	.39*	.34*

Note. AFI = Attitude Function Index; RSES = Rosenberg Self-Esteem Scale; BSRI-M = Bem Sex Role Inventory Masculine Subscale; BSRI-F = Bem Sex Role Inventory Feminine Subscale; ELS = Eysenck Lie Scale; GRBS = Gender Role Belief Scale; HS = Homophobia Scale; GTS = Genderism and Transphobia Scale.

* $p = .01$.

correlations of the GTS total score with other scales showed a moderate concordance with the modified AFI total score, $r = .55$, $p = .01$, a measure of attitudes toward gender non-conformity. Thus, another measure of anti-trans attitudes correlated reasonably with the GTS score.

In terms of discriminative validity, the GTS total score correlated poorly with self-reported self-esteem (RSES), $r = .11$, $p = \text{ns}$, masculinity (BSRI-M), $r = -.06$, $p = \text{ns}$, femininity (BSRI-F), $r = -.09$, and tendencies to present oneself in a positive light (ELS), $r = .23$, $p = .01$. These results suggest that the GTS was not simply measuring positive beliefs about the self, gender orientation, or a tendency to present oneself in a positive manner.

To test the hypothesis that personal acquaintance with someone who identifies as trans mediates anti-trans attitudes, GTS scores for those who had and had not personally met a trans person were compared. Those who had personally met a transsexual scored lower on the GTS ($M = 85.8$, $SD = 36.4$) than those who had not ($M = 106.2$, $SD = 36.4$), $t(176) = 3.3$, $p = .001$. Those who had personally met a cross-dresser scored lower on the GTS ($M = 86.8$, $SD = 33.5$) than those who had not ($M = 107.2$, $SD = 37.1$), $t(175) = 3.5$, $p = .001$. Similarly, those who were personally acquainted with a transgenderist scored significantly less on the GTS scale ($M = 68.1$, $SD = 28.1$) than those who had not met a transgenderist ($M = 105.2$, $SD = 36.1$), $t(175) = 4.5$, $p = .0001$.

Discussion

In this study, we sought to establish the reliability and validity of the GTS in a diverse sample of university students. Prior results on the internal consistency of the subscales and the scale as a whole were confirmed in the present study. A factor analysis revealed a strong two-factor solution: genderism/transphobia and gender-bashing. It is probable, given the high internal consistency for all items of the GTS, that there is a single underlying construct of anti-trans sentiment that has two dimensions.

Discriminant validity tests established that the GTS was not simply measuring self-esteem, gender role orientation, or positive self-presentation strategies. Discriminant validity tests showed that the GTS was moderately associated with homophobia and

gender role ideology in contrast to the high correlations reported in Study 2. The drop in the association between these variables may be attributed to variations in the method between the two studies. Respondents in Study 2 only had three scales to complete in a short period of time, but participants in Study 3 had many scales, and the questionnaires were randomly interspersed, so respondents may have been less able to respond consistently to the three instruments. Moreover, there were differences in the populations in these two studies; Study 2 had a much smaller and more homogenous sample than was the case in Study 3. Due to these considerations, the results of Study 3 were the more trustworthy results. Moreover, the AFI, originally designed to measure anti-gay attitudes but modified to be relevant to gender non-conformity, correlated moderately with the GTS, which suggested relatively strong convergent validity. In addition, the GTS discriminated among those who had personally met a trans person, such that those who had personal acquaintances scored lower on the scale than those who had not, a further testament to the validity of the scale.

There were a few weaknesses in this study. The factor analysis was likely limited by the small sample size. Moreover, similar tests of this scale should be replicated in community (i.e., non-academic) populations.

GENERAL DISCUSSION

The three studies reported here were designed to develop and test a new scale to measure anti-trans feelings, thoughts, and behaviors. The preliminary goal to develop a reasonably reliable and valid measure of genderism, transphobia, and gender-bashing was achieved. The GTS is a short scale that has basic internal consistency and discriminant, predictive, and convergent validity. In a variety of tests, it performed as expected, and it demonstrated reasonable psychometric properties. As the first scale of its kind, it represents an advance in the study of discrimination and prejudice against gender non-conformists, especially transsexuals, transgenderists, and cross-dressers.

Although previous research has shown acceptance of transsexuals, these studies demonstrated that anti-trans views were neither rare nor difficult to elicit. There was a wide range of responses to

the GTS scale, but some scores indicated extremely intolerant attitudes toward gender variance. The extent of negative attitudes toward gender non-conformists was somewhat surprising considering the samples studied in this report were, by and large, well-educated members of a cosmopolitan city (Montréal) well-renowned for its liberal attitudes toward sexuality and gender issues. If anything, the results obtained in these studies should be more positive toward trans people than would be found in less liberal, less educated, and rural contexts.

There are many opportunities for researchers now to explore anti-trans intolerance. Researchers can use the GTS to explore causal and correlative factors of anti-trans sentiments and behaviors. For instance, it is important to investigate some of the core values that underlie anti-trans attitudes. If one takes a functional approach to anti-trans attitudes, it would be useful to examine the role of traditional values such as social conformity, religious fundamentalism, conservative ideology, and moral dogmatism in the hatred of trans persons. Haddock and Zanna (1998) found that target groups who challenge symbolic beliefs (i.e., the target group violates cherished values, customs, and traditions) evoke particularly negative emotional reactions. Therefore, a study of what trans persons symbolize for others might be a first step in further understanding anti-trans sentiments. Thus, it may become evident as to *why* people hold negative attitudes toward gender non-conforming individuals.

APPENDIX A

GTS

INSTRUCTIONS: Please indicate how you respond to the following statements using the 7-point scale described below. Please respond **THOUGHTFULLY** and **HONESTLY** to each question. It is important to indicate how you really feel **NOW** and not how you might have felt in the **PAST**. Some of the situations may be unfamiliar to you, but try to think about similar situations you might have found yourself in. Respond to each item and do not worry about your previous responses. **THERE ARE NO RIGHT OR WRONG ANSWERS.**

Strongly agree	Agree	Somewhat agree	Neutral	Somewhat disagree	Disagree	Strongly disagree
1	2	3	4	5	6	7

Circle the number that best indicates how you feel.

1. I have beat up men who act like sissies	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
2. I have behaved violently toward a woman because she was too masculine	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
3. If I found out that my best friend was changing their sex, I would freak out	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
4. God made two sexes and two sexes only	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
5. If a friend wanted to have his penis removed in order to become a woman, I would openly support him	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
6. I have teased a man because of his feminine appearance or behavior	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
7. Men who cross-dress for sexual pleasure disgust me	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
8. Children should be encouraged to explore their masculinity and femininity	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
9. If I saw a man on the street that I thought was really a woman, I would ask him if he was a man or a woman	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
10. Men who act like women should be ashamed of themselves	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
11. Men who shave their legs are weird	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
12. I can not understand why a woman would act masculine	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
13. I have teased a woman because of her masculine appearance or behavior	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
14. Children should play with toys appropriate to their own sex	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
15. Women who see themselves as men are abnormal	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
16. I would avoid talking to a woman if I knew she had a surgically created penis and testicles	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
17. A man who dresses as a woman is a pervert	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
18. If I found out that my lover was the other sex, I would get violent	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
19. Feminine boys should be cured of their problem	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
20. I have behaved violently toward a man because he was too feminine.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
21. Passive men are weak	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
22. If a man wearing makeup and a dress, who also spoke in a high voice, approached my child, I would use physical force to stop him	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
23. Individuals should be allowed to express their gender freely	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
24. Sex change operations are morally wrong	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
25. Feminine men make me feel uncomfortable	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
26. I would go to a bar that was frequented by females who used to be males	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
27. People are either men or women	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
28. My friends and I have often joked about men who dress like women	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
29. Masculine women make me feel uncomfortable	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
30. It is morally wrong for a woman to present herself as a man in public	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
31. It is all right to make fun of people who cross-dress	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
32. If I encountered a male who wore high-heeled shoes, stockings, and makeup, I would consider beating him up	1	2	3	4	5	6	7

Note. All items except questions 5, 8, 23, and 26 are reverse scored.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

The authors acknowledge research assistance from Don Wanatanbee, Jodie Wilkins, Sarah Bloomfield, Veronica Asgary, Andrew Burr, and comments from Harriet Tenenbaum. This study was partially funded by the Society for the Psychological Study of Social Issues.

REFERENCES

- Bem, S. (1974). The measurement of psychological androgyny. *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology*, 42, 155–162.
- Coalition for Lesbian and Gay Rights in Ontario. (1997). *Systems failure: A report on the experience of sexual minorities in Ontario's health-care and social-services systems*. Toronto: Author.
- D'Augelli, A. R. (1998). Developmental implications of victimization of lesbian, gay, and bisexual youths. In G. M. Herek (Ed.), *Stigma and sexual orientation: Understanding prejudice against lesbians, gay men, and bisexuals* (pp. 187–210). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Eysenck, H. J., & Eysenck, S. B. G. (1975). *Manual of the Eysenck Personality Questionnaire*. San Diego, CA: EDITS.
- Feinberg, L. (1996). *Transgender warriors: Making history from Joan of Arc to RuPaul*. Boston: Beacon Press.
- Franzini, L. R., & Casinelli, D. L. (1986). Health professionals' factual knowledge and changing attitudes toward transsexuals. *Social Science and Medicine*, 22, 535–539.
- Gagné, P., Tweksbury, R., & McGaughey, D. (1996). Coming out and crossing over: Identity formation and proclamation in the transgender community. *Gender and Society*, 11, 478–508.
- Green, R., Stoller, R. J., & MacAndrew, C. (1966). Attitudes toward sex transformation procedures. *Archives of General Psychiatry*, 15, 178–182.
- Haddock, G., & Zanna, M. P. (1998). Authoritarianism, values, and the favorability and structure of antigay attitudes. In G. M. Herek (Ed.), *Stigma and sexual orientation: Understanding prejudice against lesbians, gay men, and bisexuals* (pp. 82–107). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Harry, J. (1992). Conceptualizing anti-gay violence. In G. M. Herek & K. T. Berrill (Eds.), *Hate crimes: Confronting violence against lesbians and gay men* (pp. 113–122). Newbury Park, CA: Sage.
- Harvey, J. (2002). *Attitudes of the general population toward transsexuals*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Southern California University for Professional Studies, Santa Ana, CA.
- Herek, G. M. (1987). Can functions be measured? A new perspective on the functional approach to attitudes. *Social Psychology Quarterly*, 50, 285–303.
- Herek, G. M. (1993). The context of antigay violence: Notes on cultural and psychological heterosexism. In L. D. Garnets & D. C. Kimmel (Eds.), *Psychological perspectives on lesbian and gay male experiences* (pp. 89–107). New York: Columbia University Press.
- Hill, D. B. (2002). Genderism, transphobia, and gender bashing: A framework for interpreting anti-transgender violence. In B. Wallace & R. Carter (Eds.), *Understanding and dealing with violence: A multicultural approach* (pp. 113–136). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Kendel, M., Devor, H., & Strapko, N. (1997). Feminist and lesbian opinions about transsexuals. In B. Bullough, V. L. Bullough, & J. Elias (Eds.), *Gender blending* (pp. 146–157). New York: Prometheus Books.
- Kerr, P. S., & Holden, R. R. (1996). Development of the Gender Role Beliefs Scale. *Journal of Social Behavior and Personality*, 11, 3–16.
- Landen, M., & Innala, S. (2000). Attitudes toward transsexualism in a Swedish national survey. *Archives of Sexual Behavior*, 29, 375–388.
- Leitenberg, H., & Slavin, L. (1983). Comparison of attitudes toward transsexuality and homosexuality. *Archives of Sexual Behavior*, 12, 337–346.
- Lombardi, E. L., Wilchins, R., Priesing, D., & Malouf, D. (2001). Gender violence: Transgender experiences with violence and discrimination. *Journal of Homosexuality*, 42, 89–101.
- Moulton, J. L., III, & Adams-Price, C. E. (1997). Homosexuality, heterosexuality, and cross-dressing: Perceptions of gender discordant behavior. *Sex Roles*, 37, 441–450.
- Namaste, K. (1996). Genderbashing: Sexuality, gender and the regulation of public space. *Environmental and Planning D: Society and Space*, 14, 221–240.
- Neisen, J. H. (1990). Heterosexism: Redefining homophobia for 1990s. *Journal of Gay and Lesbian Psychotherapy*, 1, 21–35.
- Rosenbloom, M. (1965). *Society and the adolescent self-image*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- Rye, B. J., & Elmslie, P. (2001a, August). *Attitudes toward sexual minorities: Comparisons of ratings of transgender and homosexual persons*. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Psychological Association, San Francisco, CA.
- Rye, B. J., & Elmslie, P. (2001b, June). *The Transgender Belief Questionnaire (TBQ): Development and validation*. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the Canadian Psychological Association, Québec City, QC.
- Rye, B. J., & Elmslie, P. (2002, November). *Attitudes toward transgendered people: Understanding gender diversity*. Paper presented to the Annual Meeting of the Society for the Scientific Study of Sexuality, Montréal, QC.
- Weinberg, G. (1972). *Society and the healthy homosexual*. New York: Anchor Books.
- Weinberg, M. S., Shaver, F. M., & Williams, C. J. (1999). Gendered sex work in the San Francisco Tenderloin. *Archives of Sexual Behavior*, 28, 503–521.
- Whittle, S. (n.d.). *Employment discrimination and transsexual people*. Retrieved March 3, 2003, from <http://www.gires.org.uk/>
- Wilchins, R. A. (1997). *Read my lips: Sexual subversion and the end of gender*. Ithaca, NY: Firebrand Books.
- Wright, L. W., Adams, H. E., & Bernat, J. (1999). Development and validation of the Homophobia Scale. *Journal of Psychopathology and Behavioral Assessment*, 21, 337–347.
- Zucker, K. J. (2000). Gender identity disorder. In A. J. Sameroff, M. Lewis, & S. M. Miller (Eds.), *Handbook of developmental psychopathology* (2nd ed., pp. 671–686). New York: Plenum.